DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 222 397 SO 014 206

AUTHOR Lemish, Peter S.
TITLE The Technical Approach and the Praxis Orientation to Curriculum Development.
PUB DATE Mar 82
NOTE 43p.; Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the American Educational Research Association (New York, NY, March, 1982).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Case Studies; *Curriculum Development; *Educational Theories; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; Teacher Role

ABSTRACT

Two approaches to curriculum development, the technical approach and the praxis orientation, are discussed. Curriculum specialists, textbook writers, and policy makers develop the formal curriculum as a plan which teachers implement. The most appropriate approach, according to the traditional literature, is the technical approach, the goal of which is to teach more content more efficiently with the greatest possible amount of student achievement. However, to understand the nature of the curriculum, we must look at what is implemented and experienced, not only to what is supposed to be implemented. In this view, it is the teacher who has the central role in curriculum development. As such, the praxis orientation, which emphasizes the importance of reflection and problem-oriented approaches to the educating process, becomes a more appropriate perspective for teachers than is the technical approach. Examples of how the praxis orientation may be extended to various forms of curriculum development are provided. Also included are two case studies showing how the technical approach and a praxis orientation were used in the design and development of an introductory college-level education program. (RM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED222397

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

The Technical Approach and The Praxis Orientation To Curriculum Development

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Peter S. Lemish
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Peter S. Lemish

Faculty of Educational Foundations and Research

Office of Program Development

College of Education

Ohio State University

Paper presented at the Annual Conference of American Educational Research Association

March 1982 New York

SP 014 236

In the reality of everyday life in the educating process, the curriculum is produced through the interactions of teacher and students. Teachers know that the "experienced" curriculum, or "what happens," is often quite different from "what was supposed to happen," as stated in lesson plans or in the "formal," written curriculum. Yet, the conventional literature of curriculum development seems to ignore this disparity. Rather, the topics addressed are concerned with the design, implementation, evaluation, and change of the formal curriculum, as a plan. The "technical" approach, as a systematic model for developing such a curriculum, is proposed in this literature as the most useful method for producing such a plan. Juxtaposed to this approach, the "praxis" orientation is based upon an understanding of the nature of the experienced curriculum. This understanding becomes the basis for an on-going process of interpretation and adjustment of intentions for facilitating the educational experiences of the participants.

The praxis orientation presented in this paper is an extension of a rich tradition of educational thought concerned with understanding the nature of educating as it is experienced by the participants. As the most recent group of persons working in this tradition, writers associated with the "reconceptualists" (Pinar, 1975, 1978a, 1978b) or the "new sociology of the curriculum" (Giroux, 1979) have been concerned with exploration, conceptual understanding, critique, and educational theory. However, limited attempts have been made so far to extend these understandings into the practical-everyday life experiences in educating. The praxis orientation presented here is an initial proposal for such an extension of this work. As such, it is an attempt to bridge the gap discussed by Barone (1982):

> So, like some of the "reconceptualists," I too deplore ahistoricality and atheoreticality in curriculum writing. But may I also suggest that the power of the reconceptualists could be enhanced by grounding some of their meta-talk in specific examples and by attempting to speak to practioners instead of to themselves? I do not believe that such conversations must necessarily cloud a curriculum philospher's visions of what curriculum could be. Indeed, whether there is to be a cultural revolution in education or just incremental improvements, won't practitioners need to be involved?
>
> The kind of theory envisioned here is for thoughtful practitioners. It will hopefully aid in, first, improving the design, selection, and implementation of programs and materials, and ultimately providing more profound and liberating educational experiences for students.
>
> Such theory does not predict - at least not in the strict sense of that term, but it can educate about possibilities. The text of .....documents what <u>did</u> happen, and therefore suggests what <u>can</u> happen. Planners reading such critiques of <u>educational</u> programs should be more informed about the nature and value of the experiences being recommended to students in their own programs. LIkewise, a teacher presented with a set of portraits of the transactions between materials being considered for adoption and students in other classrooms settings would presumably be in a positions to make a wiser diecision.
>
> Barone, in press

Similarly, this paper includes both theoretical discussion and a case study of theory-in-use. In the theoretical discussion, a set of distinctions about the nature of curriculum development will be proposed and then followed by analysis of two approaches to curriculum development. The "Introduction to Education Program" is described and critiqued as a case study in the application of the technical approach and the praxis orientation.

The Nature of Curriculum Development

Preliminary Distinctions

Characterizing the nature of curriculum development is complicated by noting that <u>what</u> curriculum development is, is linked directly to <u>who</u> does curriculum development. A further complication is the misunderstanding found

in the conventional curriculum literature that school persons actually design the formal curriculum. Today, however, four groups may be identified as ones directly involved in curriculum development efforts. The most visible group are the curriculum specialists employed by school districts to - design and evaluate curricula, write graded courses of study, select textbooks, and coordinate curricular efforts. Developers share a common background as subject-matter specialists with the academics who write textbooks and develop other curriculum materials as well as evaluate curriculum in schools. Academics also prepare these developers through their curriculum studies courses at the graduate or curriculum certification levels. Recent analyses of textbook adoption processes demonstrate the significant role of textbooks and textbook writers in the development of curricula (Anyon, 1979b; Options in Education Series on Textbooks, 1981; Twenty/Twenty television report on textbook adoption in Texas, 1981; Wise, 1979).

The existence of an adoption process itself indicates one type of curriculum development activity of a third group - policy makers and enforcers. At the local, state, and national levels, political representatives/appointees influence curriculum by setting policies which mandate both the form and substance of curriculum (Anyon, 1981; Apple, 1979; Sharp and Green, 1975; Wise, 1979; Young, 1971). These decisions set the guidelines for as well as accomplish the adoption of curricula.

These three groups share in common the following aspects of curriculum development:

* Control over the formal, written curriculum;
* Design and evaluation of the formal curriculum;
* Distance from the daily process of curriculum production;
* Formal prescription and control of knowledge.

Teachers, as a fourth group, are also involved in curriculum development. However, the control maintained by the three groups just described often limits teachers' involvement with the formal curriculum to serving an occassional term on textbook or objectives committees. Indeed, from the points of view of subject-matter specialists and policy makers, teachers have been assigned the task of implementing the curricula developed by others. Though it may appear that teachers have been disenfranchised from the process of curriculum development, what needs to be emphasized are the actual ways in which teachers do control the curriculum and are directly involved in its development. This view is grounded in an understanding of the nature of everyday life in classrooms (Bossert, 1979; Hammersly, 1977; Mehan, 1978, 1979; Stubbs and McDermott, 1976).

In their everyday experiences, teachers interpret and adapt the curriculum and textbooks as they interact in and facilitate classroom life. In this way teachers, together with students, produce and live through what may be called the "experienced" curriculum. Given the unique way of life constructed by each classroom group, curriculum development becomes an on-going process; a process in which the "formal" curriculum exists as a set of guidelines. In fact, through this process, the actual/experienced curriculum may only be fully known during or even after the term or school year is completed.

The distinction of the formal from the experienced curriculum is useful in coming to understand the different types of curriculum development efforts. For example, all four of these groups are involved in efforts involving the selection and organization of the knowledge to be taught to/learned by students (n.b. the conventional definiton of curriculum). However these efforts are related to different aspects of the development process. Here the distinction of formal from experienced curriculum can be embellished through the construct of "coupling" (Weick, 1976).

The formal curriculum usually exists as a written document. The development of his document is directed and controlled by the governance groups, administrators, and curriculum specialists. "Tight coupling" insures that the decisions made by these groups result in the rational organization and control of the formal curriculum. For example, state and local governance groups often specify the subjects to be taught in schools, competencies to be learned, the goals and objectives to be attained as well as the materials/textbooks to be used in instruction. This control is tight because it presumes to standardize through specificity, prescription, and the limiting of options while establishing accountability through assigned responsibility (i.e. teacher implementation).

The curriculum produced and experienced by teachers and students is "loosely coupled" to the formal curriculum. Everyday life in classrooms is a "practical accomplishment " (Garfinkel and Sacks, 1970); that is, it is produced through the rules, routines, interpretations, and practical actions of the actors. The practical dimensions involve teachers and students in the cooperative construction of the educating process (Florio, 1978; Lofland, 1976; Strauss, 1979). The role of the teacher is to mediate and to facilitate this process. However, in this role, teachers confront and manage "uncertain practical problems" (Gauthier, 1963; Reid, 1979):

> practical problems are the kinds of problems that we face most of the time, and in fact, people are quite good at solving them....(yet) uncertain practical problems....present many kinds of complexity. Such a problem is "a problem about what to do ....whose solution is found only in doing something,in acting"(Gauthier, 1963, p. 49).
>
> Reid, 1979, p. 189.

Reid suggests that this complexity may be indicated by the following characteristics of such practical problems:

> First, the problem requires a decision and action. Second, the grounds on which decisions should be made are uncertain (i.e. limited evidence, data). Third, an existing state of affairs must be taken into account. We are never in a position to make a completely fresh start, free from the legacy of past history and present arrangements. Fourth, each problem is unique, belonging to a specific time and context, the particulars of which we can never exhaustibly describe. Fifth, the problem compels us to adjudicate between competing goals and values. Sixth, we can never predict the outcome of the solution we chose.....Finally, the grounds on which we decide to answer a practical (problem) are not grounds that point to the desirability of the action chosen as the act in itself, but grounds that lead us to suppose that the action will result in some desirable state of affairs.
>
> Reid, 1979, p. 189

Taking action upon "uncertain practical problems" is a central part of teachers' involvement in curriculum development. Indeed, their decisions and actions in selecting and organizing knowledge, when confronted with "uncertain practical problems," involves them in a considerably different type of development effort than the three groups previously mentioned.

The differentiation of the formal from the experienced curriculum helps to distinguish different types of curriculum development efforts. Unfortunately conventional curriculum literature has not addressed this differentiation. In failing to do so, we have neglected, first, to analyze the nature of these processes of curriculum development as well as how they differ from one another. Second, we have not examined the relationship between the formal and experienced curriculum. Rather, the conventional approach has assumed that the formal curriculum is implemented in a standardized manner, that it is completed, and that evaluation will discriminate among student achievements.

The conventional approach to curriculum development has prescribed technical methods to be used in designing, implementing, evaluating, and changing the formal curriculum. The central thesis of this paper is that the technical approach is inappropriate for accomplishing the efforts associated with the development of the experienced curriculum. Furthermore, an analysis of curriculum

development which begins with an understanding of the nature of the experienced curriculum should enable us to alter substantially our understanding and development of the formal curriculum. This argument is presented in the following presentation of the technical approach and the praxis orientation to curriculum development.

The Technical Approach and The Praxis Orientation

Of the various models of curriculum development presented in the traditional literature, the technical is generally accepted as the conventional approach (e.g. Gay, 1980; Zais, 1976). Juxtaposed to the technical, the praxis orientation is based upon a significantly different understanding of the development efforts involved in producing the curriculum. The discussion of each includes propositions of the underlying theoretical assumptions as well as the approach/orientation to curriculum development.

Technical Approach

Theoretical Propositions - Much analytical and critical attention has been directed to the theoretical assumptions of the technical approach (e.g. Ellul, 1964; Fay, 1977; Habermas, 1973; Marcuse, 1964; Radnitzky, 1968). The basic assumptions, constructs, and goals of this approach may be summarized in the following propositions:

* Nomothetics - There is a universal, cause-effect, law-like order in society. Once understood, knowledge, skills, attitudes, and values may be objectified, predicted, and controlled. An example of such understandings is as follows: People are basically responsive to nature and react to stimuli from society and the environment. While there are differences among people, there are a greater number of similarities. Thus, the "normal curve" is a reliable indicator of behavior in educational settings. Persons trained to understand

these universals, the experts, can be depended upon to apply their knowledge to direct behavior across contexts.

* Technical/Systematic Orientation - The means-end, incremental approach to problem solving or planning of action is the most reliable. Once goals and objectives are established, a structured, step-by-step procedure, which is rational, systematic, and efficient, should be followed in order to solve a problem or to plan. The model used in engineering and economics is to be emulated.

* Management, Control, and Authoritarianism - Persons, knowledge, and actions have universal characteristics. Once these universals are understood, trained experts can direct the behavior of children or teachers to achieve, for example, learning in an efficient manner.

Experts are entrusted with responsibility to plan or to direct actions. These persons are appointed to "positions of power so that they can alter social conditions to control and so alter social and psychological processes." (Fay 1977, p. 203) Legitimate authoritarianism often develops due to the special training which knowledgeable persons have received.

* The Practical and The Instrumental - Everyday life consists of practical problems and actions requiring decisions. There are methods or techniques which can be learned and applied to achieve the predetermined, desired goals of the activity (Ellul, 1964). Knowledge, for example, has a structure which can be broken down into constituent parts and organized for instructional purposes.

Technical Approach to Curriculum Development - The technical approach is the one most commonly presented in curriculum texts (Saylor and Alexander, 1966; Taba, 1962; Tyler, 1950; Zais, 1976). Indeed, it has been claimed that it has been the conventional as well as the predominant approach to curriculum development for the major part of this century (Apple, 1979; Eisner, 1979; Gay, 1980; Kliebard, 1970). Historically, this approach dates back to the work of F. Taylor,

F. Bobbitt, and W.W. Charters. Tyler and Taba are recognized as having given it the most succinct formulation. More recently the work of G. Beauchamp, M. Johnson, J. Popham, and G. Mager as well as competency/performance-based systems may be associated with the technical approach to curriculum development.

In the technical approach, the curriculum is a formal plan which is assumed to be operable across contexts. The general goal of this plan is to teach more content (i.e. knowledge, skills, attitudes, and values) more efficiently with the greatest possible amount of student achievement. The most reliable and valid content available is selected and it is organized in the most efficient, effective manner by the experts who develop the plan. Curriculum planned in this manner has been characterized in the following way by Huebner:

> Current curricular ideology reflects almost completely a technical value system. It has a means-end rationality that approaches an economic model. End states, end products, or objectives are specified as carefully and as accurately as possible, hopefully in behavioral terms. Activities are then designed which become means to ends or objectives.
>
> Huebner, 1975, p. 223.

The curriculum plan is developed by means of a systematic process. In this approach, "curriculum development" has a specific role in the production process

> Curriculum work in real school settings consists of three essential processes: Curriculum construction ...(is) the decision-making process that determines the nature and design of the curriculum; curriculum development ....(is) the procedure for carrying on the construction process; and implementation is the process of putting into effect the curriculum produced by curriculum construction and development.
>
> Zais, 1976, p. 448.

Thus, the production of the curriculum plan is viewed as a "highly technical, complex, and specialized process (Ibid, p. 449). Therefore knowledgeable, trained experts, usually subject matter specialists, are given responsibility to produce such curricula.

Praxis Orientation

Stated succinctly, the praxis orientation emphasizes enlightened-transformative action. Enlightenment is arrived at through reflection upon the pattern of assumptions, values, and meanings embedded in the actions of persons in a situated context. Understandings derived through enlightenment lead to transformative action when, through reflection, aspects of experience are judged to be problematic and alternative forms of experience are proposed-accomplished. Thus, the praxis orientation is a perspective through which individuals come to understand and then intervene to transform their own lives in particular settings. The following is an elaboration upon this statement.

Theoretical Propositions- The praxis orientation is based upon three traditions of continental social philosophy - phenomenology, hermeneutics, and critical theory. Extended explication of these philosophies while desirable is not possible given the thrust of this paper. However, the following propositions of the praxis orientation represent summary statements of basic assumptions and constructs associated with these traditions.

* Nature of Everyday Life - Everyday life is a practical accomplishment. Yet, as participants in everyday activities, we generally assume that life is given as it is and that it is basically the same for all of us. However, with some thought, we come to recognize that our lives as individuals and in groups are different. By assuming a "natural attitude " (Schutz, 1962, 1964), what we neglect to notice is that, together with our consociates in a setting, we construct and order our world through our shared knowledge, intentions, methods, experiences, and practical accomplishments (Berger and Luckman, 1966; Garfinkel and Sacks, 1970; Schutz, 1962, 1964).

* Constitutive Relationism - Society is constructed through the social interactions we engage in purposefully with one another; that is, through social interaction we co-determine or constitute society. "Constitutive relationism" is

a dialogical process in which there can be no separation of person from society; both are needed and exist in a reciprocal, co-constitutive relationship (Gurwitsch, 1964; Riegel, 1979).

> By acting on the external world and changing it, man, at the same time, changes his own nature.
>
> Marx, 1954

> Man is biologically predestined to construct and to inhabit a world with others. This world becomes for him the dominant and definitive reality. Its limits are set by nature, but once constructed, this world acts back on nature. In the dialectic between nature and the socially constructed world the human organism itself is transformed. In this sense dialectic man produces reality and thereby produces himself.
>
> Berger and Luckman, 1966, p. 183

Thus, individuals and society are interrelated and constantly changing. Relative stability is maintained through constructed rules and patterns of behavior. These rules and patterns act as forms of synchronization providing stability over time. In synchronic time, history is formative for future development (i.e. spiral concept of time juxtaposed to linear notion. Riegel, 1979).

There are, then, in society, shared-interpreted sets of meanings, understandings, and patterns of behavior which are manifest in participants' actions. The meanings, rules, and patterns of these interactions are interpretable, but such interpretations are restricted to the history and nature of the particular social context (Mannheim, 1921; Garfinkel, 1967).

> .....society is a process of creative interpretations by individuals who are engaged in a vast number of concerted interactions with each other. It is this we label social structure.
>
> Hiller quoted in Sharp and Green, 1975, p. 19.

> Whatever the basis of interaction the knowing subject is forever in a dialectical relationship with himself in terms of the interaction of I and the me, and with the social structure of interrelated interpreting consciousness. This fundamental tension between the self and others means that socity should be seen as continually in process, a process which results from the stream of creative interchanges between conscious knowing subjects and the boundary

> conditions of their social and non-social environment. Since institutional structures result from and are stabilized by the creative interpretations of social actors, they are open to continual transformation and change.
>
> Berger and Luckman, 1966, p.20.

There is an ecological network and patterned sets of constitutive relationships of individuals in society. We must understand the whole set of interrelationships in order to understand any one part of the context as a whole (Bronfenbrenner, 1979; Mannheim 1921).

* Experience, Reflection, and Enlightenment - Each individual is the producer of his/her own experiences. However, acceptance of the "natural attitude " leaves significant dimensions of our lives unquestioned, misunderstood, or 'taken-for-granted'. Understanding the meanings, values, needs, and intentions of our own and others' actions can be obtained through directed reflection or inquiry. With this process comes illumination or enlightenment about the nature of the assumptions, values, and commitments involved in the interactions with other persons or ideas as well as a sense of the value of life (Gadamer, 1975; Schutz, 1962, 1964).

> The purpose of reflection is to enable individuals to know themselves and their situation through retrospection, and thus bring to consciousness the process of social formation .....
>
> Fay, 1977, p. 206.

* Critique and Transformative Actions - In the praxis orientation, individuals move beyond discovery of the patterns of meaning and value involved in social life. Praxis involves the individual/s in critical inquiry; that is, there is a critical interpretation or critique which identifies, questions, and seeks the contradictions or the problems involved in the outcomes and consequences of social life (Giroux, 1980b). It is by responses to the problematic

as it impacts on our own and others' lives, that social actions can become transformative or emancipatory. The transformative process, thus, evolves when we question, make the "taken-for-granted" problematic, and seek alternative forms of social life.

> Simply to dwell on the surface structure of consciousness may conceal and distort the underlying structure of relationships.
>
> Lukacs, 1971; Quoted in Sharp and Green, 1975, p.22.

> To be critical will mean, then, to go beyond the dominant ideology or ideologies, in one's attempt to explain the social world..... To be critical is to challenge social legitimizations and funadamental structures. It is as Horkheimer said (1972) to seek, to explicate, to seek to eliminate structurally-induced exploitation and social pain. One attempts to identify material power and constraints, and the dominant ideologies that obscure, these.
>
> The Critical Theorist, then, willgo beyond appearances, and beyond dominant ideologies, and will attempt to identify and challenge underlying causes. Because these causes are seen to be fundamental, the Critical Theorist is seen as leading to transformative social strategies.
>
> Anyon, 1980, p. 15

Thus, critique or critical interpretation is problem-posing. To pose problems is to question <u>why</u> things are the way they appear to be and to question if such circumstances are <u>humane</u> or good for human life.

> In problem posing education, men develop their power to perceive critically the way they exist in the world <u>with which</u> and <u>in which</u> they find themselves; they come to see the world not as a static reality, but as a reality in process, in transformation.
>
> Freire, 1970, p.

> ....we need to develop some conceptualizations of the situations that individuals find themselves in, in terms of the structure of opportunities the situations make available to them and the kinds of constraints they impose.....the position which we are advocating raises the (highly problematic) issue of the relationship between men's consciousness of their situation and the social reality in which they are embedded.
>
> Sharp and Green, 1975, p. 22-23.

* Praxis Orientation - Building upon the previous assumptions, the praxis orientation involves individuals in enlightened-transformative action. Praxis presumes that the forms of understanding which evolve from critical inquiry will enable us to direct our actions for the improvement of both our immediate setting as well as the world.

> Men will be truely critical if they live in the plentitude of the praxis, that is, if their action encompasses a critical reflection which increasingly organizes their thinking and thus leads them to move from a purely naive knowledge or reality to a higher level, one which enables them to perceive the causes of reality.
>
> Freire, 1970, p. 125.

For the praxis oriented individual, theorizing which is part of the enlightenment-transformative process, is not a separate, cognitive activity; rather it is interrelated with and coterminus with the process leading to transformative actions:

> Cognition is not simply contemplation, it is the understanding of reality in as far as humankind shapes it in the process of living it.
>
> Giroux, 1980b, p. 28.

Praxis can become an ontological domain once we consciously move to include the reflective-transformative posture in our everyday life: As I identify, interpret, and question the underlying and emergent patterns of meanings, values, and assumptions in everyday life, my actions are influenced and, perhaps, directed to transform the social world within which I interact. As in the hermeneutic circle, enlightened-transformative action is a constant process of reinterpretation and reconscientization for informed action.

Praxis Orientation Extended to Curriculum Development

There is significant body of educational literature to which the praxis approach is related. Although educators in this tradition addressed a wide number of subjects, they all generally agreed in their critique and rejection of the use of the technical approach in education. As well, they emphasized the importance of reflection and problem-oriented approaches to the educating process. John Dewey, Boyd Bode, and George Counts were early writers in this tradition. The progressive movement in the 1930s and 1940s and the open school movements in Britain and America purposefully attempted to develop alternative approaches to the dominant technical approach. During the last two decades such persons as Michael Young, James Macdonald, Paul Klohr, Herbert Kliebard, Dwayne Huebner, Maxine Greene, and Elliot Eisner engaged in critical interpretations of various aspects of experience in educational settings. In the 1970s the work of Michael Apple, Henry Giroux, Madeleine Grumet, William Pinar, Rachel Sharp, and Max Van Mannen among others contributed to this tradition.

While the latter two sets of persons were critical of the technical, the major thrust of their work is to explore, clarify, understand, and, often, to critique the processes involved in educational experiences. In addition these writers, perhaps more than in previous generations, base much of their interpretive posture in the continental social philosophies including various forms of phenomenology, hermeneutics, and critical theory.

Recently, a main emphasis in this tradition has been placed upon exploration, conceptual understanding, criticism, and educational theory. Thus the purpose of investigations was not necessarily practioner-oriented or knowledge-method producing (Macdonald, 1971). However, those of us who read and find ourselves influenced by as well as in agreement with many of the ideas discussed, cannot but consider how to integrate or relate these

insights into our daily educational activities. The praxis orientation as discussed in this paper evolved out of such a stimulation. Note that the intention here is not to claim that a specific approach or set of guidelines can be drawn from this tradition and then applied. Rather, it is argued that there are understandings and processes which may be extended and related to our work as educators. The following extensions seem appropriate to curriculum development efforts and shall be identified as the praxis orientation.

The praxis orientation is a perspective for understanding and acting in educational life. Through this perspective educators come to understand themselves as well as their setting, the students, the subject-matter, and potentials for change.

> The practical result....is not the means for greater manipulative power but rather the self-understanding that allows one's own rational thinking to be the cause of one's actions.
>
> Fay, 1977, p. 207.

> Theorizing contributes to one's resourcefulness....by directing questions toward the source itself; the source which gives life or spirit to (inspires) our pedagogic life. To theorize is to achieve one's limits, to find one's origins, one's grounding in that which makes our pedagogic life possible.
>
> Van Mannen, 1980, p. 12-13

Thus, assuming a praxis orientation is to involve <u>oneself</u> in an educating process. Through this process educators may come to understand and question the constraints which limit their activity:

> The perspective we are advocating is one which attempts to situate teachers' world views and practices within the context of social and physical resources and constraints which they may or may not perceive, but which structure their situation and set limits to their freedom of action through the opportunities and facilities made available to them and the constraints and limitations imposed upon them.
>
> Sharp and Green, 1975, p.30.

The work of Paulo Freire is an exemplary model for such a process (Freire, 1970, 1973)

Among educators in an educational setting, the praxis orientation could be facilitated when the following considerations are taken into account (Based upon Fay, 1977, p. 230):

* Persons involved are the primary actors or members in the setting;
* Working groups are relatively small and they operate in an egalitarian trusting, and supportive fashion (n.b. in the sense that no member has control or command over another without the other's approval);
* Members are relatively free of recrimination and intimidation and they are committed to rationally discussing their own and others' experiences and ideas as well as the mediating influences in their setting;
* Members assume responsibility for whatever decisions, claims, or actions they undertake to make;
* Members are encouraged to participate as they are able to draw upon their individual creative potentials.

The praxis orientation may be extended to various forms of curriculum development efforts in the following ways:

* Design of Formal Curriculum - The formal curriculum is a broad plan of action consisting of proposed directions for action (e.g. core concepts, processes, relationships among ideas) which are to be tried, documented in terms of what happened, analyzed, adjusted or redeveloped on an on-going basis. For example, the proposed subject-matter is examined in terms of its - relatedness to other subjects and to the students; potential value and possible impact or consequences; assumptions, core constraints, main ideas; and rational structure.
* Adoption Committees - From the praxis orientation, curriculum efforts that are limited to the adoption of textbooks, prepared curriculum programs (i.e. teacher proof curricula), or objectives are a form of constraint which limit both teachers' and students' freedoms. Options for transformation include - involvement in the political process which will influence policy makers to provide release time for teachers to become

involved in development of plans of action, documenting, and creation of their own resource materials; direct confrontation to gain control formally of the development process; proposals of adoptions of very different types of materials so that individual teachers will have options for selection.

* Developmental Inquiry in Educating Settings - The purpose of developmental inquiry is to engage in enlightened-transformative actions which will redirect an established or prescribed curriculum. The process of developmental inquiry involves documenting the experienced curriculum in terms of what took place, why, and participants' perceptions or feelings. Based upon documentary evidence, members are able to analyze, interpret, question, and judge the nature of the experienced curriculum. Proposals for change can be discussed, attempted, documented, and analyzed in an on-going process of development (n.b. developmental inquiry based upon Sanders, 1981).

A Case Study of Theories-In-Use

From the perspective of both the technical approach and the praxis orientation, curriculum development is concerned with the practical dimensions of educating. Extended to curriculum development, then, both the technical and the praxis become forms of theory-in-use. The following case study is presented for the purpose of clarifying and understanding this extension as well as the consequences of these theories-in-use when they are grounded in educational settings.

The design and development of an entry-level set of two courses, to be refered to as the Introduction to Education Program (IEP), began six years ago in the teacher education program at a large midwestern university.* Since then, IEP has undergone two phases of formal development. Each phase involved a different approach/orientation to curriculum development. The

* The name of this program as used in this paper is fictitious.

first phase of development is an example of the technical approach; the second phase is an example of how the praxis orientation was extended into the developmental inquiry process.

Descriptive-Analysis

Context

In 1974, the State Board of Education adopted State Standards for Colleges and Universities Preparing Teachers. Teacher education institutions were to be in compliance with these standards by July 1, 1980. The new standards claimed to be "illustrative of the new foundations upon which teacher education..... is being built." Indeed, the topics addressed in these standards seemed to touch upon all aspects of a teacher education program - organization, curriculum, faculty, students, services, facilities and evaluation. However, the specificity of the mandates varied for each of these areas. For example, the redesign of the curriculum seems to have received special attention:

(A) The body of knowledge, skills, attitudes, and values determined essential for effective teaching shall be specified for each field in which the college or university is approved to prepare teacher education students.

(B) .....The teacher education curriculum shall adequately reflect identified and significant academic and social concerns which would include:

1. the teaching of reading, as it pertains to the field for which certification is sought;
2. human relations as it relates to teaching.....
3. analysis and evaluation of one's performance skills as they relate to teaching behavior;
4. dealing with behavior problems.....;
5. selection, preparation, and effective utilization of educational media to facilitate learning.

(C) (teacher education) students shall participate in a series of carefully planned, supervised, and evaluated clinical experiences.....

(D) (teacher education) students shall participate in a series of carefully planned, supervised, and evaluated field experiences.....

(E) ....Clinical and field experiences shall be

1. an integral part of the teacher education curriculum, commencing early therein and continuing in a sequential manner;

2. related to school-aged youth

3. equivalent in time to one full quarter in addition to the student teaching experience.

(F) A complete description of the teacher education curriculum for each field including, but not limited to, the sequential learning needed within the body of knowledge, skills, attitudes, and values as identified through instructional objectives and syallabus for each course, clinical experience, and field based experience.....

On the other hand, the only mandate for instruction was that

> each teacher education curriculum shall utilize a variety of appropriate instructional procedures which contribute to the effectiveness of the students' preparation.

Additional state monies were made available to programs as they submitted plans for redesign efforts.

Phase One-- Construction, Development, and Implementation of the Formal Curriculum

From 1974-1976 a number of task forces and eventually a special teacher education committee developed plans for bringing the College of Education into compliance with the new state standards. Among the recommendations accepted by the College Senate was the proposal of a new entry-level set of two courses, called Introduction to Education Program (IEP). An initial design that was developed by the sub-committee for IEP and approved by the College Senate included the tentative objectives and an outline of the general content of IEP. The content prescribed included the "five special areas" (see standards part "B"), plus the full content of two previous courses now collapsed into IEP (n.b. Theory and Methods of Teaching and Educational Psychology). Funds were allocated for further development and five assistant professors were hired to develop and teach these courses.

The new faculty-developers were "specialists" in the content areas specified in the IEP proposal and each assumed responsibility for developing and coordinating "their" part of the program. Since the faculty-developers had no time to engage in advanced preparation, the first year was a trial and error period in which several different curricular and instructional formats were tried.

By the beginning of the second year, twelve units had been developed, each a reflection of the faculty-developers particular approach to their content area. Each unit prescribed the objectives, activities, content, resources, and means of evaluation for each day of instruction. Five graduate teaching associates were added to the staff. All course instructors were required to teach the course, unit by unit, as they had been developed. A comprehensive evaluation system was instituted to insure standardization, accountability, and to control for grade inflation. All instructors were required to use the same unit tests, assignments, examinations, and grading system. Although some management and organizational changes were made, the final course proposal approved by the College Senate was based upon the design developed in the second year.

As an approved program, IEP now became a requirement for all students entering the College of Education. A much larger staff was needed to serve the quarter enrollments of 400 students per course. Eight new graduate teaching associates were hired because of the enrollment increase and the fact that the previous year's staff did not return to the program. Over the summer faculty-developers adjusted their units and their course materials were now placed in two large binders, one for each course. A three day orientation was held to introduce new staff to the program's curriculum. New instructors were directed to follow the units as explicated as well as to use the assignments and evaluation system as detailed in the course materials.

During this year a number of significant problems surfaced. The program coordinator returned to his home department and conflicts between the faculty-developers led to dissension and a lack of program coordination. While generally satisfied with the efforts of their instructors, students indicated in their course evaluations that they were dissatisfied with the program. In general, they believed that the evaluation system was unfair, the curriculum was uneven in its demands with too many constraints placed on instructors and that the program was poorly administered. Graduate teaching associates voiced views similiar to those of the students and, in addition, argued that they should be able to adjust the courses, if even slightly, to students' learning styles and needs as well as their own teaching styles. Furthermore, these graduate students thought that with their previous years of teaching experience, their studies, and their experiences with IEP that they were qualified to criticize or make suggestions for improving the program, yet their opinions were neither solicited nor were they accepted when offered to the faculty-developers. Only one graduate student was willing to return the next year. Finally, faculty members throughout the College were critical of the program's curriculum for its lack of articulation, balance, or coordination; the program's faculty for their lack of experience in teacher education; and the Dean for retaining administration of the program at the college-wide level.

Phase Two -- Developmental Inquiry of the Experienced Curriculum

The new program coordinator, a member of the Dean's staff, was faced with all the problems just enumerated.* The course of action she chose was to stabilize the program in order to study and develop plans for appropriate change. To this end, she initiated the following sets of activities:

* a developer and a graduate student were assigned the task of bringing organizational and linguistic unity to the units and other course

* The author assisted the Program Coordinator in Phase Two.

materials by editing them;

* The same three day orientation and set of instructions were used to introduce an entirely new staff to the program. However, weekly "brief and debrief" staff sessions were held. The faculty-developers were asked to provide the rationale for each unit as well as to consider instructors' questions, suggestions, and complaints. Notes were taken in order to document issues and ideas discussed in these sessions.

* A graduate associate was assigned to provide administrative assistance and support to the entire staff.

* Observations for documentation purposes were made in classes.

* Students' evaluations of the program were analyzed and the results reported to the staff.

* no meetings of the developers were called or took place with the coordinator alone.

By the end of the first quarter enough data had been gathered and analyzed to warrant the initiation of activities that would lead to transformation of the program. Several full day staff meetings were held for discussion of these data. A large number of questions, issues, problems, complaints, and suggestions were raised and analyzed. On the basis of these discussions, the coordinator together with the staff proceeded with the following activities during the remainder of the year:

* Ad Hoc Committee on Student Evaluation - Over 70% of the written student evaluations of the program, compiled from over a two year period, complained that the evaluation system was unfair. Therefore an Ad Hoc Committee was established for the purpose of investigating all aspects of the assignment and evaluation components of the program. The members appointed included two faculty-developers, two graduate teaching associates, and two members of the College-wide faculty. Two of the members were evaluation specialists. This committee met weekly for two quarters. The final report they submitted is now

regarded as one of the most complete investigations in the College's recent history. This report included a thorough analysis of pro and con positions on the evaluation system as well as options for changing the ways in which students are evaluated. Finally, the Committee found that in the desire to provide standardization it was quite likely the case that the academic freedom of instructors had been violated and that students' full range of capabilities and learning were not represented in the evaluation system.

* Development Committee - A development group of graduate students was established for the purpose of analyzing, interpreting, and proposing options for change in the program. Members assumed responsiblity for development projects in specific areas of the program.

* Curriculum Articulation Committee - One of the major problems identified by the staff, through the documentation and analysis process, was that the formal curriculum was fragmented and lacked articulation. Having been developed by separate persons, each unit was a distinct entity and as a result the program lacked a clear conceptualization. This committee was chaired by the program coordinator. They analyzed the curriculum and developed a proposal that provided the curriculum with an overarching conceptualization, a rationale, and articulation - in terms of scope, sequence, and balance. Furthermore, this proposal indicated how the program could maintain standardization while allowing for instructor initiative and facilitation of courses.

While these activities were going on, no programmatic changes were made and documentation of the experienced curriculum continued. As committees progressed in their work, reports were made to the whole staff for discussion and criticism of their proposals.

At the end of the Spring Quarter, the staff met to review both the year and committees' proposals for program options. This discussion was provocative and productive because all the staff had been involved in the analysis process and all had experienced the curriculum. On many issues

and options there was consensus, others remained to be decided by the coordinator. What evolved were a set of interventions or changes in the program and its curriculum that were developed and supported by most of the staff. The major recommendation accepted was to replace the prescriptive, unit design(i.e. separate subject approach) with an integrated, fusion model. Instructors were to design their own courses, but were required to include core components and the general conceptualization.

During the summer a group of staff persons worked to prepare the changes so that they could be implemented in the Fall. The following major changes were prepared:

* A Program Description was developed which presented a fully conceptualized and articulated core curriculum. This four page statement was intended to be used by both instructors and students to understand the general nature of the program.

* A Program Manual was developed which included - a description and definition of core curriculum components and concepts; an overview of resources available; and a list of suggested instructional options. This 50 page manual was intended as a guide for instructors' construction of their courses.

* Program Resource Books were compiled as a two volume collection of resources for use by instructors. Volume One consisted of exemplars of instructional options. Volume Two included a variety of articles for use by students and instructors. Most of these initial materials were products of the faculty-developers. However the major changes made were that these materials were optional, they could be used on any day, and that instructors were encouraged to create and then contribute their own materials to this collection.

* Institute for Teacher Educators in Training - A two week orientation for all staff members was developed. The purpose of this Institute was to introduce instructors to the program and to assist them

in the design of their own courses. Arangements were made for instructors to be paid as well as to receive graduate credit for this work.

The present year began with the Institute for Teacher Educators in Training. Twenty staff members participated, including six returning graduate teaching associates and four faculty members from the College who had been assigned to teach in IEP. At the end of the Institute each instructor presented his/her course including a description of the evaluation system to be used. Questions were directed to the presenters and suggestions or possible problems were shared.

In weekly staff meetings, instructors discuss successes and offer suggestions for problems. Documentation of the program continues by - noting issues and problems raised in staff meetings; and weekly summative statements written by instructors documenting the "experienced" curriculum. New committees have been formed to analyze and to propose options for dealing with curriculum problems identified by the staff.

Morale among the staff seem to be quite high this year. Six graduate associates from the previou[illegible] returned and indications are that most of the present staff will be with the program next year. Instructors are creating and contributing new materials and resources to the program files for others to use. In fact so much has been contributed that the two Resource Books have had to be replaced by a full standing filing cabinet. The program office is now a resource center. Conversation among instructors includes the sharing of ideas or suggestions for solving problems, rather than the talk in previous years about how poorly everything seems to be going. In short, there is evidence to suggest that the staff has taken ownership and that they are proud of the program.

* * *

This case study is both provocative and useful for understanding the nature

of curriculum development efforts. The two phases of its development are dramatically different and illustrative of distinct approaches to curriculum development. In addition, there are a number of critical issues and problems embedded in the history of IEP which should be exposed and related to the nature of curriculum development. These differences will be highlighted by discussion of the consequences of the two phases of IEP in the Critique section. Issues embedded in the case study will be discussed as part of the conclusion.

* * *

Critique

Phase One - In many respects the curriculum produced in Phase One of the IEP is prototypical of the technical approach to curriculum development. First, the program's objectives and general content were prescribed as policy decisions by the College Senate (i.e. Curriculum Construction). Then, the five faculty-developers, who were subject-matter specialists and thus qualified as experts, engaged in the conventional form of Curriculum Development. In these efforts they produced the formal curriculum; that is, they designed and prescribed for instructor implementation a written plan.

The faculty-developers produced and implemented, purposefully, a teacher-proof curriculum(i.e. a curriculum to be implemented as prescribed to all students without authorized adaptation by individual instructors as well as a curriculum plan that provided all that was necessary to know to teach the courses). This was considered to be necessary because the high student enrollments would require a large staff composed of graduate associates and these instructors were untrained teacher educators who would also leave the program after a year or two. Furthermore a standardized and teacher-proof curriculum was necessary to maintain control and the efficient management of the program. Thus, like the French model, on

any one day all instructors should be found to be teaching to the same objectives with the same content, activities, and resources. Student learning would thus be predictable and controlable.

The consequences of this technical approach were quite clear, particularly to the graduate associates and the students. First, there was an open disregard by some of the faculty-developers for the capabilities of the graduate instructors. They, in turn, became passive recipients of the faculty-developers' prescriptions; that is, they learned very quickly that they were to implement and not to work to improve the program. Some instructors did assume this role. Others, we suspect, "closed their door" and adapted the curriculum to their students and their teaching styles. In either case, staff morale was low, there was dissension, and often open hostility between faculty-developers and the rest of the staff. Much of this problem filtered into the College and IEP quickly developed an extremely negative image.

Second, as a result of the separate subject matter approach adopted by the faculty-developers, there was no overarching conception of the course and consequentially little coordination, consistency, or balance among the units. Since each faculty-developer alone was responsible for his/her units, the curriculum as a whole was a reflection of the idiosyncratic and significantly different approaches to education of the faculty-developer. For example, the human relations specialist developed the first unit of the program in such a way as to assist students to explore their career goals as an educator and, in a supportive peer environment, to discuss how they plan to begin achieving these goals in the course. The next unit was on instruction. Here, however, the faculty-developer believed that "students can be motivated and learn best by finding out how hard it is to teach." Therefore, he sent them out to the field with limited preparation, had them experience failure, and then taught them how to plan lessons, select the

appropriate instructional activities, etc. the right way. A later unit concentrated on applying knowledge of human development to learning and instruction. The human development specialist believed that students should take responsibility for teaching their peers and so assigned them a textbook chapter to present to the class. Neither the program coordinator or the faculty-developers perceived any problem with this diversity. In fact, the disparateness was defended as academic freedom.

Third, the formal curriculum, as a written plan, was assumed to be reliable and valid. The experienced curriculum, as reflected in student evaluations and instructor complaints, was ignored. As students and instructors experienced these units, they perceived and complained about the contradictions, fragmentation, and lack of organization in the curriculum. Since neither of these groups were considered to be knowledgeable or trained, their complaints were considered to be personal opinion and therefore not of merit. Management problems could be adjusted, all other problems were considered to be caused by poor instruction or student deficiencies. Many students became cynical and bitter about the program. More importantly, some lost interest in and respect for education since the program was modeling what they perceived to be the problems and not the solutions to life in educating settings.

Finally, in fairness to the faculty-developers, the curriculum they produced was not totally of their own making. Both the State legislature, through the redesign standards, and the College Senate prescribed what was to be included in the curriculum, in part. Here are examples of the impact of political and policy groups on the development of curriculum. The Senate in particular played a major role by simply requiring that most of the new content in state standards was to be met through this course. The college hired faculty-developers who were young, articulate, desirous of an academic career, and well-trained in their areas of specialization. However, not one of these persons had

background in teacher education. In short , policy, political, and administrative decisions dictated the framework within which the program was to operate. Unfortunately no one was prepared to question the College's arrangement of the program or the curriculum produced.

Phase Two - Developmental inquiry was applied in "phase two" of this program. This inquiry process, though now into its second year, is still in an early stage of the enlightenment-transformation process. Although our work is intended to be an extension of the praxis orientation, at best what has taken place is a series of half-steps toward transformation-emancipation.

Initially, the most important strategic decision was to stabilize the program. All too often persons with authority and repsonsibility, upon inheriting a program with significant problems, set out to "correct" matters themselves. Our strategy was to involve the staff in the process of change by having them "discover" the nature of the problems. The one exception was any aspect of the program that could have a detrimental affect upon a student's or a staff member's functioning in the program. Hence immediate attention was directed to bringing order to the administrative area of the program.

Stabilizing the program enabled us to document and to study the experienced curriculum. Multiple sources of data were used in documenting - issues and problems raised by the staff in 'brief-debrief" sessions, faculty-developers' rationale statements and their general responses to problems posed, student evalutations, and observations. Documenting was important for discovery of problematic problems as well as for political purposes. Later, through the documentation, we were able to demonstrate the need for change.

Participation in meetings and in documentation enabled staff members to come to understand the experienced curriculum. Analysis, interpretation, problem-posing, and the proposal of alternatives became part of the inquiry

process and led to enlightenment about the nature of the program. Within the short period of three months, the staff had documented and reaffirmed the problems reported in previous years as well as several new problems. Now, however, the difference was that the staff had the freedom to be critical and to assume the responsiblity for proposing change. While stability was retained for six more months, the staff was involved in a thorough process of analysis, review of various literatures, and proposal/ examination of options for transforming the program.

Problems singled out for particular attention were - the prescriptive, teacher-proof curriculum; the assignment and evaluation system; the lack of articulation in conceptualization of the program; and the magnitude of the content to be included in the program as prescribed by the College Senate. However, above these matters, a humane set of value concerns were used to critique the nature of the educational experiences in this program for both students and staff. It is clear that without assuring the staff that the changes they proposed would become legitimate options in the following year's program that there would have been, again, a high rate of staff turnover.

Several significant outcomes have been realized in this process: First, there is an understanding that the experienced curriculum is the guide to understanding the nature of the program. Second, instructors are no longer consumers of other persons prescriptions. Rather they are consciously involved in producing and contributing to the development of the program (Mooney, 1975). Finally, as active participants in this process, ownership, a desire to contribute, and a sense of community have evolved.

To this point we have facilitated the "enlightenment" process; however, we have just begun to move toward "transformation." In a sense we have made a series of <u>half-steps</u> toward transformation -we have made major changes in

the areas of the program that we control. What remains are confrontations with groups which ultimately have the policy and political control to dictate the program's destiny. To move closer to a radical transformation, the staff might submit a proposal to the College Senate redefining and limiting the content and objectives prescribed for the course. Beyond this there are many questions about the approach taken to educating teachers that the staff may want to pose and take to be problematic. However, through continuation of developmental inquiry, the process of problem-posing continues. Perhaps the staff will be able to take the remaining half-steps and through expanding enlightenment move closer to the transformation of this program.

Conclusion

The purpose of this paper is to present the theoretical assumptions and extensions to curriculum development of two very different perspectives on developing the curriculum - the technical approach and the praxis orientation. A case study was examined in order to understand the possible consequences and problems involved when each is extended into curriculum development efforts.* This case study is, also, a rich source of issues and problems relevant to the nature of curriculum development. By way of conclusion, several of these issues are presented and discussed in relation to the technical approach and the praxis orientation.

The Nature of Curriculum Development

Understanding the nature of curriculum development requires distinguishing the persons who influence and engage in curriculum development efforts from the curriculum development process and product.

Developers of Curricula - Earlier we noted the curriculum specialists, textbook writers, and policy makers are involved in the development of the formal curriculum as a plan which teachers implement. The traditional literature

* Note that the two phases were described here rather starkly for the purposes of comparison. Both phases had many more successes/failures than could be noted.

proposes that the technical approach is the most appropriate for developing such a plan. However, to understand the nature of the curriculum, we must look primarily at what is implemented and experienced, not only to what is supposed to be implemented. In this view, it is the teacher who has the central role in development of curricula. As such, the praxis orientation discussed in this paper is a more approriate perspective for teachers than is the technical approach.

This conclusion is supported by the resurfacing of an emphasis on the role of the teacher in curriculum development (Connelly and Ben-Peretz, 1980; Sabar et al, 1982). Two arguments are applied in this emphasis: First, based upon research on innovation, it is acknowledged that the top-down management, technical approach "has proven to be an ineffective way of introducing educational and pedagogical innovations into schools" (Sabar, et al., 1982, p. 53). Two conclusions summarize the thrust of this research: (1) The quality and likely success of an innovation are related to the degree of its congruence with the users' needs and goals. (2) Congruence is enhanced when the innovation is developed by its natural users. The direct implication is that the users must be actively involved in the development of an innovation that directly affects their lives (Fullan, 1972; Sanders and Schwab, 1981). Based upon these conclusions, Connelly and Ben-Peretz (1980) and Sabar et al (1982) discuss how the teacher can take a more active role in the development of quality curricula and curriculum materials.

A second argument applied to support the active role of the teacher is based upon the conceptual understandings of Schwab (1970, 1971, 1973). In analyzing what has been referred to here as "uncertain practical problems," Schwab argued that curriculum development is mainly a process of deliberation to resolve specific problems (1970). Through the deliberation process, teachers come to understand the relationship of the problem to other factors in the

setting. By emphasizing understanding these practical problems, over theoretical discussions or solutions, teachers are more likely to discover appropriate solutions.

While the work of Schwab parallels, in part (Schubert, 1980), the enlightenment thrust in the praxis orientation, it lacks the transformative dimension. Deliberation for the purpose of developing appropriate, short term responses to problems is not sufficient in the praxis orientation. Rather, enlightenment must include understanding the interrelated networks of constraints as well as lead to development of responses to the manifestations of the deeply rooted problems. In the case study examined here, the humane, value-oriented dimensions were the most compelling form of critique. This critique revealed how the top-down management model and the authoritarian style alienated the staff and paralyzed the program. The praxis orientation was introduced as an alternative. Significant changes resulted when the active participation of all staff was built into the development process and when understanding the experiential curriculum became the focus of analysis. Through developmental inquiry the natural users/producers of the curriculum were supported in their efforts to critique, appropriately challenged,and recognized as active creators, contributors and developers of the program.

Relationship of the Formal Curriculum and the Experienced Curriculum -

When developed as a plan for action and prescribed for implementation, the the formal curriculum exists as a statement of "what is supposed to happen." Yet, the "uncertain practical problems" confronted by teachers in their everyday experiences in educational settings require that the implementers - the teachers - interpret, adapt, and redirect the plan. Hence the experienced curriculum , or "what happened," is often quite different from the formal curriculum. Yet, by assuming that the formal curriculum is the experienced

curriculum, through use of the technical approach, by the disenfranchisement of teachers from development of the formal curriculum, and the politicization of curriculum, it is assumed that teachers are implementing the curriculum.

The praxis orientation, on the other hand, assumes that through their responses to "uncertain practical problems," teachers are developers of the experienced curriculum. The praxis process builds in documentation, analysis, and interpretation of the experienced curriculum as a way to understand, make problematic, and propose options for development of the curriculum. In turn, these changes lead to adjustment of the formal curriculum. Thus the formal curriculum evolves as a summative statement of what happened. Relating the experienced curriculum to formal curriculum seems to be a more defensible, accountable, and responsible manner of curriculum development.

Praxis Orientation Related to Curriculum Development

From the praxis orientation perspective, developers of curriculum should pose problems which challenge the apparent order in the educational setting. Developmental inquiry was proposed in this paper as a process that should facilitate both an enlightened, problem-posing posture as well as the generation of responses intended to transform the educational setting in a humane, value-oriented direction. Thus the praxis orientation emphasizes enlightened-transformative action.

Enlightenment and transformative responses are interrelated, in synchronic, dialectical fashion, just as theory and practice are interrelated. The theorizing process inter-relates reflection and action: Thus, by reflection upon actions in an educational setting as meaningful accomplishments, we come to understand the nature of our own forms of "personal knowledge" (Polanyi, 1958) as well as probe for the meanings, assumptions, values, and constraints present in the actions of others. Similarly, the enlightened understandings which evolve

not only assist us to pose problems, but, as well, facilitate intentions and meanings for future responses.

While this theorizing process enables us to deal with many of the everyday problems associated with educating, there are more entrenched problems which require specifically a value-oriented, political response of greater magnitude:

> The organization of action must be distinguished from this process of enlightenment. While the theory legitimizes the work of enlightenment, as well as providing its own refutation when communication fails, and can, in any case, be corrected, it can by no means legitimize a fortiori the risky decisions of strategic action. Decisions for the political struggle, cannot at the outset be justified theoretically and then be carried our organizationally. The sole possible justification at this level is consensus aimed at in practical discourse, among the participants, who, in the consciousness of their common interests and their knowledge of circumstances, of the predictable consequences and secondary consequences, are the only ones who can know the risks they are willing to undergo, and with what expectations.
>
> Habermas, 1973, p. 33.

There are several problems and issues in this case study, for example, which qualify as examples of such transformative actions:

* The posture toward students and instructors which resulted in the presence of dissension, hostility, and low morale in Phase One threatened what was perceived by members to be a basic tenet of education, captured succinctly by Newman and Oliver (1967):

> the most fundamental objective of education is the development of individual human dignity, or self-realization within community.
> p. 1.

In the view of participants, both this dignity and community were violated. Direct intervention achieved through developmental inquiry led to actions intended to produce dramatic transformation in the program.

* Academic freedom, authoritarianism, and what may be described as the "normal curve view of human nature" were all identified as problems by

the staff during developmental inquiry. Confronting such problems is an example of the application of a humane, value-oriented form of problem-posing critique. Direct actions taken to confront these problems included - involving all the staff in developmental inquiry, enabling instructors to construct their own courses and direct confrontations with persons espousing the "normal curve" view.

* The political actions of the state in its redesign of teacher education as well as the policy role of the College are example of the politicization of the curriculum. No actions have been developed for confronting the bodies which place these constraints upon education and the curriculum through these political actions.

Finally, to balance this discussion and to place in a broader perspective the nature of our concerns in education, we must ask how curriculum developed relate to the major contemporary social issues of race, sex, class, and authority oppressions (Albert and Hahnel, 1978). Based upon the educational history of the two orientations discussed in this paper, it is possible to conclude that developers applying the technical may address these concerns. However, it is more likely to be the case that educators with a praxis oriented posture are likely to pose problems related to these issues. Indeed, according to Pinar, such a radical approach is called for in the reconceptualization process:

> The reconceptualization aspires to critique which insists upon the transformation of extant structures. It shares with critical theory the view that criticism must not reify that which it identifies and explains. It must function to dissolve foreign structures. Thus implicit in such an analysis of contemporary educational practices is their transformation.
>
> Pinar, 1978a, p. 5.

Taking this posture one step further, the argument presented in this paper has claimed that enlightened-transformative analysis can be extended into the practical dimension of life in educational settings. By doing so, we not only will begin the transformation process, but in return we shall enrich our understanding of the praxis orientation.

Bibliography

Albert,M. and Hohmel, R. UnOrthodox Marxism. Boston: South End Press, 1978.

Anyon, J. "Education, Social Structure, and the Power of Individuals," Theory and Research in Social Education. 7:1 (Spring 1979a), pp. 49-60.

Anyon, J. "Ideology and United States History Textbooks," Harvard Educational Review. 49:3 (August 1979b), pp. 361-386.

Anyon, J. "Schools as Agencies of Social Legitimization," Journal of Curriculum Theorizing. 3:2 (Spring 1982), pp. 86-104.

Apple, M. Ideology and Curriculum. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1979.

Barone, T. "Insinuated Theory from Curricula-In-Use." Theory Into Practice. In press.

Berger, P. and Luckman, T. The Social Construction of Reality. N.Y: Doubleday, 1966.

Bossert, S. Tasks and Social Relationships in Classrooms. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979.

Bronfenbrenner, U. The Ecology of Human Development. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1979.

Cherryholmes, C. Theory and Practice in Education: Issues in Reflective Theory and Reflective Practice. Paper presented at AERA, Los Angeles, March 1981.

Connelly, M. and Ben-Peretz, M. "Teachers' Roles in the Using and Doing of research and Curriculum Development." Journal of Curriculum Studies 12:2 (1980), pp. 95-107.

Eisner, E. The Educational Imagination. NY:Macmillan, 1979.

Ellul, J. The Technological Society. NY : Random House, 1964.

Fay, B. "How People Change Themselves: The Relationship Between Critical Theory and Its Audience." In T. Ball. Political Theory and Praxis New Perspectives. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1977.

Florio, S. Learning How To Go To School. Unpublished Dissertation. Harvard Univeristy, 1978.

Freire, P. The Pedagogy of the Oppressed. NY : Seabury, 1970.

Freire, P. Education for Critical Consciousness. NY : Seabury, 1973.

Fullan, M. "Overview of the Innovation Process and the User." Interchange. 3:2-3 (1972), pp. 1-46.

Gadamer, H-G. Truth and Method. NY : Continuun, 1975.

Garfinkel, H. Studies in Ethnomethodology. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1967.

Garfinkel, H. and Sacks, H. "On Formal Structures of Practical Actions." In J. McKinney and E. Tiryakian (Ed). Theoretical Sociology. NY; Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1970.

Gauthier, D. Practical Reasoning: The Structure and Foundations of Prudential and Moral Arguments and Their Exemplications in Discourse. London: Oxford University Press, 1963.

Gay, G. "Conceptual Models of the Curriculum-Planning Process," In A. Foshay (Ed). Considered Action for Curriculum Improvement. Alexandria, Va.: ASCD, 1980.

Giroux, H. "Toward a New Sociology of Curriculum." Educational Leadership. (December 1979), pp. 248-254.

Giroux, H. "Dialectics of Curriculum Theory." Journal of Curriculum Theorizing. 2:2 (Summer 1980), pp 27-36.

Gurwitsch, A. The Field of Consciousness. Pittsburg, Pa.: Duquesne University, 1964.

Habermas, J. Theory and Practice. Boston: Beacon Press, 1973.

Hammersly, M. (Ed). School Experience. London: Croom Helsey, 1977.

Huebner, D. " Curricular Language and Classroom Meanings." in W. Pinar (Ed) Curriculum Theorizing. Berkeley: McCutchan, 1975.

Kliebard, H. "Reappraisal: The Tyler Rationale." School Review. Feb. 1970, pp. 259-273.

Lofland, J. Doing Social Life. NY: Wiley, 1976.

Macdonald, J. "Curriculum Theory." Journal of Educational Research. 64:5 (January 1971), pp. 196-200.

Mannheim,K. "On the Interpretation of Weltanschauung." Translation by G. Hinkle, Department of Sociology, Ohio State University, 1980.

Marcuse, H. One Dimensional Man. Boston: Beacon, 1964.

Mehan, H. " Structuring School Experiences." Harvard Educational Review. 48:1 (February 1978), pp 32-64.

Mehan, H. Learning Lessons. Cambridge. Mass: Harvard University Press, 1979.

Mooney, R. "The REsearcher Himself." In W. Pinar (Ed). Curriculum Theorizing. Berkeley: McCutchan, 1975.

Newman, F. and Oliver, D. " Education and Community." Harvard Educational Review. 37:1 (Winter 1967), pp 61-106.

Pinar, W. "Preface." Curriculum Theorizing. Berkeley: McCutchan, 1975.

Pinar, W. "Notes on the Curriculum Field 1978." Educational Researcher. 7:8 (September 1978), pp. 5-12.

Pinar, W. "What is Reconceptualization." Paper delivered at Curriculum Theory Conference, Rochester, NY, May 1978.

Polanyi, M. Personal Knowledge. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1958.

Radnitzky, G. Contemporary Schools of MetaScience. Chicago: Regnery, 1968.

Reid, W. "Practical Reasoning and Curriculum Theory: In Search of a New Paradigm." Curriculum Inquiry. 9:3 (1979), pp. 187 - 207.

Riegel, K. Foundations of Dialectical Psychology. NY: Academic Press, 1979.

Sabar, N., Silberstein, M., Shafriri, N. "Needed: Curriculum Coordinators for Teachers Developing Learning Materials." Curriculum Inquiry. 12:1 (1982), pp. 53-67.

Sanders, D. "Educational Inquiry as Developmental Research." Educational Researcher. 10:3 (1981), pp. 8-13.

Sanders, D. and Schwab, M. "Schooling and the Development of Education". Educational Forum

Saylor, G. and Alexander, W. Curriculum Planning for the Modern School. NY: Harper Row and Winston, 1966.

Schubert, W. "Recalibrating Educational Research: Toward a Focus on Practice." Educational Researcher. 9:1 (1980), pp.17-25.

Schutz, A. Collected Papers I : The Problem of Social Reality. The Hague: Nijhoff, 1962.

Schutz, A. Collected Papers II: Studies in Social Theory. The Hague: Nijhoff, 1964.

Schutz, A. The Phenomenology of the Social World. Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern University Press, 1967.

Schwab, J. The Practical: A Language for Curriculum. Wash. D.C.: NEA, 1970.

Schwab, J. "The Practical : Arts of Eclectic." School Review. August 1971, pp 493-542.

Schwab, J. "The Practical 3: Translation Into Curriculum." School Review. August 1973, pp501-522.

Sharp, R. and Green, A. Education and Social Control. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1975.

Strauss, A. Negotiations. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1978.

Stubbs, M. and Delamont, S. (Ed). Explorations in Classroom Observation . London: Wiley, 1976.

Taba, H. Curriculum Development. NY: Harcourt, Brace, and World, 1962.

Tyler, R. Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1950.

Van Mannen, M. "Pedagogical Theorizing." Paper delivered at AERA. Boston, 1980.

Weich, K. "Educational Organization as Loosely Coupled Systems." Administrative Science Quarterly. 21 (March 1976),.

Wise, A. Legislated Learning. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1979.

Young, M.F.D. (Ed). Knowledge and Control: New Directions for the Sociology of Education. London: Collier-Macmillan, 1971.

Zais, R. Curriculum. NY: Crowell, 1976.